THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 9, No. 39 (Broadcast 424) September 30, 1963 Dallas, Texas



DAN SMOOT

McNAMARA'S COMMISSARS

On July 26, 1963, Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, issued a directive, "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces," ordering all military commanders to take action in and against civilian communities around military bases, whenever those communities do not wholly support the President's racial program.[1]

The author of this directive is Adam Yarmolinsky, whose parents are notorious communist-fronters and who has a record of participation in communist activities since his undergraduate days at Harvard.[2]

The Yarmolinsky directive implements recommendations of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. Appointed in June of 1962, this Committee had seven members: three of whom were negroes, the other four being connected, in one way or another, with the Americans for Democratic Action, the Anti-Defamation League, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the National Urban League.[1]

On June 13, 1963, the Committee submitted a 93-page report, popularly known as the Gesell Report, after the name of a Washington, D. C. lawyer, Gerhard A. Gesell, Committee chairman.

The Gesell Report was written by a Sacramento, California, negro attorney, Nathaniel S. Colley, an NAACP official.[3]

United States Representative Joe D. Waggonner, Jr. (Democrat, Louisiana) first brought the Gesell Report to public attention. In his July, 1963, newsletter, Representative Waggonner outlined some of the Report's major provisions:

— More recruiting should be directed toward Negroes, to get more into the services and to increase the number of Negro officers.

— Negroes should be located in jobs throughout the services regardless of their individual preferences in order to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a magazine published every week by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., mailing address P. O. Box 9538, Lakewood Station, Dallas, Texas 75214; Telephone TAylor 1-2303 (office address 6441 Gaston Avenue). Subscription rates: $10.00 a year, $6.00 for 6 months, $18.00 for two years. For first class mail $12.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14.50 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for $1.00; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10.00 — each price for bulk mailing to one person. Add 2% sales tax on all orders originating in Texas for Texas delivery.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1963. Second class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.
No reproductions permitted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—Promotion Boards should have more Negro officers, fewer Whites.

—Special Officers should be appointed on every base to handle all complaints of Negroes, and such complaints should be "encouraged."

—More Negro girls are to be brought on bases for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation.

—Negro hostesses should be considered rather than White.

—Military Police patrols used in neighboring communities should be integrated.

—Segregated busses should be boycotted.

—Base Commanders should appoint bi-racial committees in the communities to break down segregation practices.

—Civic clubs should not be joined if they are segregated.

—The past policy of complying with local segregation policies should be terminated.

—The practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and Whites to another should not be permitted, even though this might be of their own choosing.

—Methods are suggested for getting around local segregated housing by leasing homes in the name of the government and moving Negroes in.

—ROTC units should be cancelled in segregated schools.

—The traditional function of the Base Commander and Senior Officer to run a military establishment and maintain good community relations by staying out of local controversies is misguided and should be stopped. They should be encouraged to lead the way to full integration.

—Military personnel should be allowed to patronize only those local establishments which are integrated and have the "express approval" of the Base Commander. All others should be placed off-limits. Approved stores should display placards or decals on their windows and doors to show they have been approved by the military. This gives the Base Commander life-or-death control of the economic life of the community and the right to subject to military discipline all servicemen, their wives and children who shop at other stores of their own choosing.

—Should all these efforts fail to bring about integration, the Services must consider curtailing or terminating activities at these installations.

According to the Gesell Report, military officers are no longer to be rated for professional excellence, devotion to duty, or superior performance. Their careers will depend on their zeal in promoting the President's political objective of enforcing total integration, not just in the Armed Forces, but on the civilian population of the nation.

To guarantee zealous and ideologically correct behavior on the part of military commanders, the Gesell Report recommends assignment of special "complaint officers" whose role is virtually identical with that of political commissars whom communists attach to every military command in the Soviet Union. The Gesell Report also provides for an informer system inside each military command — similar to the informer system in communist armies — enabling informers about racial matters to by-pass the normal chain of command, and shielding the informers from the necessity of identifying themselves and facing the persons they accuse. Examine these passages from the Gesell Report:

"Complaints, involving matters relating to a single person, such as failing to be promoted, cannot ordinarily be investigated without disclosing the identity of the aggrieved individual. This is not true, however, where the complaint discloses a discriminatory condition on base, such as a segregated NCO [Non-Commissioned Officers'] club. Such conditions can be investigated and eliminated without the need for identifying a particular complainant . . . .

"In order to improve the processing of complaints at the base level, procedures must be established which will encourage Negro personnel to present complaints of discrimination while eliminating the risk that they will be subject to criticism or reprisal for so doing. In order to accomplish this, an officer should be designated at each base to receive such complaints. This officer must have free access to the base commander or his deputy for the purpose of communicating and discussing complaints of discrimination. Commanders at bases must, of course, be held personally responsible for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effectiveness of the system and for conditions on the base. Discriminatory conditions may exist even where few complaints are made, and the commander should be held accountable to discover and remedy such conditions . . . .

"In view of his role as a confidential counselor, consideration should be given to the designation of the local legal assistance officer as the officer to receive such complaints, but the base commander should be free to designate the officer best qualified for such duties, regardless of the officer's other duties. However, the officer so chosen must not be so burdened with other duties that he cannot effectively deal with complaints presented to him; he should be so situated that servicemen can contact and consult him in privacy; and he should be independent and free from intimidation by any person in the performance of his duties.

"Under this system, all base personnel should be repeatedly and periodically advised of the identity of the complaint officer, and further advised of their right to present complaints. Service regulations should forbid attempts to discourage the presentation of such complaints or reprisals against complainants, and all personnel should be advised that such attempts, in violation of these regulations, will subject them to disciplinary action.

"Such day-to-day efforts to discover and eliminate examples of discrimination at the base level should be checked and supplemented by periodic field visits from personnel from the Department of Defense who are skilled and sensitive in handling problems of discrimination and whose full-time energies are devoted to such problems. In this way, commanders' efforts can be measured . . . ."[1]

"Infamous . . . Shocking . . . Ominous"

On August 7, 1963, United States Representative L. Mendel Rivers (Democrat, South Carolina) led a discussion, in the House, of the Gesell Report.[1] Here are extracts from that discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS: We will have a number of contributors to this discussion . . . of [one of] the most infamous documents ever devised by human hand, known as the Gesell report . . . .

Now, you spend over $52 billion a year on the military. This destroys it . . . . We have Armed Forces for one reason and one reason alone, for the defense of the United States of America . . . .

But . . . this highly inflammatory, vicious, and extremely prejudiced report . . . . takes the military out of the role of providing for the national security and plunges them into the role of social reformers . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE F. EDWARD HEBERT (Democrat, Louisiana): I want to read this shocking statement from the report . . . :

It should be made clear that officers, for showing initiative and achievement in this area [the area of integrating local communities] will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS: Anything short of this will automatically identify this commander as uncooperative . . . .

If we live by this and the directives emanating from it, what good is West Point, what good is Annapolis, what good is the Air Force Academy, what good is the science of warfare, combat efficiency, combat readiness? . . .

The directive means only those who are willing to accept integration completely and without reservation as a way of life will henceforth be able to make a career of the Armed Forces of the United States.

REPRESENTATIVE H. R. GROSS (Republican, Iowa): After setting up what will become a commissar on each base, an officer to hear complaints, the report reads as follows:

All personnel, officers and enlisted men, should be free to contact the officer designated to receive complaints at any time without the consent, knowledge or approval in the chain of command.

Communications between servicemen and this commissar [sic] should be privileged and service regulations should prohibit the disclosure of such communications, or the identity of the complainant without the serviceman's consent.

This will create . . . the biggest army of snoopers and informers that the military has ever heard of. This is an outrage.

REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS: It could be the beginning of SS troops in America . . . .

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPRESENTATIVE DURWARD G. HALL (Republican, Missouri): God forbid that we have an OGPU or an SS in our military. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina. I have serious doubts about the military or the legal qualifications of this study . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE W. ANDREWS (Democrat, Alabama): I would like to ask . . . if this committee report recommends a spy system to be called a monitor, with an especially sympathetic monitor through the range of troop levels in order to check on commanders as to how they carry out this function . . . . Is it not true that the Communists have such a spy system and have had it since the beginning of the Russian Revolution in 1917? . . .

I can tell you . . . there is such a spy system and it is directed by a man known as a political commissar, whose business it is to watch all military commanders and to report to another agency on the manner of the performance of that duty.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, if this committee report is implemented, and certain implementing orders have been issued . . . we are well on the way to dictatorship in this country . . . .

Never has our Nation faced such a threat. Never have we been faced with such devastating implications. The President is playing with an ominous toy. He would make the military a political puppet controlled by strings pulled only by the Executive.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMIE L. WHITTEN (Democrat, Mississippi): One other thing that has led to the destruction of so many nations is the fact that instead of trying to have their defense establishment strong as can be, for the defense of their country, they have had mercenary soldiers using their funds in foreign lands to get someone else to do the defending of their country . . . . We do this today . . . . We have about let military spending be the dominant voice in everything that goes on around us . . . . We are spending something like 60 percent of our entire national budget for what is called defense, much of it not real defense at all . . . . Economic power is the instrument of dictatorship just as much as troops or marshals . . . .

The [Gesell] report culminates a series of steps whereby the powers that be — and here it happens to be the Secretary of Defense—use the power of the purse, the power of the draft, the power of the military in the name of the Commander in Chief, use these things that are said to be needed to defend our country, in reality to destroy everything which we claim Russia would destroy . . . .

Mr. Speaker, we destroy ourselves at home. We do to ourselves what it is charged Russia would do to us.

We see our leaders using troops, economic pressure, the courts, the marshals, and all the rest, all, in the final analysis, being steps to a complete dictatorship . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS C. WYMAN (Republican, New Hampshire): It is clear from Mr. McNamara's letter to the President [McNamara's letter of July 24, 1963, informing the President that a directive implementing the Gesell Report was being issued] that he is doing so on orders from the White House . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE HEBERT: Adam Yarmolinsky . . . is the author of the new directive issued by the Secretary of Defense . . . .

Mr. Yarmolinsky has one objective in mind — with an almost satanic . . . zeal — the forced integration of every facet of the American way of life, using the full power of the Department of Defense to bring about this change . . . .

I want to tell you something about Mr. Yarmolinsky . . . . He was down in Florida [during the Cuban crisis] and he ordered the troops integrated in certain hotels that the military had rented. He was informed that the Negroes did not want to be integrated. He said he did not give a damn whether they wanted to be integrated or not, that they would be integrated . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE MELVIN R. LAIRD (Republican, Wisconsin): I have served on the Board of Advisors of the Air Force Academy, the Naval Academy, and the U. S. Military Academy at West Point . . . . It was just 2 years ago that Adam Yarmolinsky made a recommendation to the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel that the procedures for admittance to the service Academies, particularly Annapolis, be changed so that the college board exams and the other required examinations for admittance . . . be set aside so that special examinations could be given in order to afford preferential entrance treatment . . . .

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPRESENTATIVE HEBERT: I am not as concerned about integration and segregation as I am concerned about the paramount principle involved in what we are talking about today . . . . It is the principle of using the military might and power of this country to enforce a political philosophy of an administration that is in power at the moment . . . . What General Walker . . . [was accused of doing] . . . . is [now] being ordered to be done by this Executive order . . . .

The Defense Department is talking out of both sides of its mouth. On the one hand they are using the military to enforce these [integration] orders . . . . [but] a little segregation is being practiced [as a matter of policy] . . . . Right now on the desk of somebody in the Department of Defense are orders to all commanders not to send Negroes to Iceland . . . . In that same office are orders to commanders not to send Jews to Egypt and Saudi Arabia . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE LAIRD: Within the last month in my State of Wisconsin, the Department of Defense has gone beyond its scope and its responsibility in the awarding of Government contracts on a competitive basis. The clear intent of the Department was to bring about economic and sociological change through abuse of its power to review and award contracts.

In this case . . . . the low bidder happened to be a concern in Wisconsin. The award of the bid was delayed because in answer to a Department of Defense questionnaire, this corporation showed that they had no Negroes on their payroll . . . . In the community involved, there could not be any Negroes on the payroll as there are none in the area, and if this were required by the Department of Defense, it would necessitate the importation of individuals to work in this community . . . .

It seems to me, this whole operation of the Department of Defense in the economic and in sociological areas must be brought under close examination by the Committee on Armed Services . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE HEBERT: The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Barry Goldwater] made the statement on the floor of the other body that the Defense Department had in its possession the income tax returns of individuals. A denial was quickly and heatedly issued from the Pentagon . . . . I make this unequivocal statement here, that the Defense Department has in its possession right now dossiers, little black books, if you please, on leading citizens of the State of Mississippi, and I challenge them to deny it, because if they do I will release the names and what has been said about them. I further say to you that the Defense Department has in its files economic reports on military bases in segregated areas and communities.

REPRESENTATIVE GROSS: . . . . I will say this, as I have said before, that after reading the report and reading it thoroughly, if the report and its recommendations are fully implemented, and apparently it is going to be made completely effective by the Secretary of Defense, if I were a base commander . . . I would get my affairs in order and resign immediately. I would not want to be the commander of a single military base in the United States and be compelled to submit to this kind of a directive and the political dictatorship recommended in the Gesell report . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE WYMAN: For the life of me I cannot understand what appears to be a deliberate and intentional scuttling of morale and efficiency in the Armed Forces in this way . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE OTTO E. PASSMAN (Democrat, Louisiana): This is . . . a radical attempt to take over our Defense Establishment; and, in the national interest, it must not be allowed to proceed. Upon sober reflection the Secretary of Defense must surely recognize that it is his duty to rescind this unjustified and unjustifiable order and, then, promptly to act accordingly . . . .

REPRESENTATIVE WYMAN: The Congress can rescind this Executive order by legislation right now. We ought to do this because while it is patently a violation of the constitutional enjoinder that legislation is for Congress . . . I fear it will be a long day in Siberia before the U. S. Supreme Court, as presently constituted, . . . decrees [it illegal] . . . for the military to legislate in this fashion . . . .

On September 17, 1963, Representative Carl Vinson (a liberal Georgia Democrat who, in most matters, supports the Kennedy administration) introduced HR 8460—which was written with the help of Representatives Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. Edward Hebert, and L. Mendel Rivers. HR 8460 would prevent the implementation of the Gesell Report, and make it a courtmartial offense for any member of the Armed Forces to use the powers given them by the various McNamara directives. Representative Waggonner said there is strong support for the Bill. If public support is strong enough, it will pass.

Long Chain of Abuses

It is especially infuriating to recall that Kennedy and McNamara, now *using* the military as a club against the civilian population in connection with the most delicate and dangerous political issue of our time, *muzzled* the military with regard to criticizing communism—prohibiting military officers from making speeches telling the truth about communism.

The Pentagon-State Department policy of silencing anti-communists in the military services became apparent in 1960 during the Eisenhower administration; but it did not become a conspicuous and arrogant affront to the intelligence and patriotism of the public until Kennedy came to power.

It was in January, 1961, after Kennedy's inauguration, that Admiral Arleigh A. Burke was prohibited from saying in a public speech that the Soviets are untrustworthy. It was in April, 1961, that Kennedy removed Major General Edwin A. Walker from command in Germany because Walker had created an anti-communist troop-indoctrination program built on the positive ideals of Love of God and Love of Country. It was in June, 1961, that Senator J. William Fulbright submitted his infamous memorandum to the Defense Department, arguing that the people should be kept in ignorance of issues in the Cold War so that they will blindly support whatever policies the President proposes and that, therefore, all anti-communists and other critics of administration policies should be silenced or removed from the Armed Forces; and it was in December, 1961, that Walter Reuther submitted to Attorney General Robert Kennedy a memorandum recommending the same policy with regard to the military.

The drive to transform American Armed Forces into a centralized absolutism, in defiance of the lessons of history and the combat experience of American fighting men, began in 1943 during the Roosevelt administration. A major step in that direction was taken in 1947 when Congress authorized Truman to create the Department of Defense, to "speak with one voice" for all the military services. In 1953 and 1958, Eisenhower took further steps toward monolithic unification and began shifting responsibility for military planning away from officers with combat experience, putting it in the hands of desk officers and civilians.

Nonetheless, strong-willed military men with combat experience, who understand the realities of war and the nature of the communist enemy, were still in control of the military services when Kennedy became President and appointed Robert S. McNamara Secretary of Defense.

Kennedy and McNamara have gradually squeezed such men out—such men, for example, as Admiral George W. Anderson, Jr., removed as Chief of Naval Operations in the summer of 1963—allegedly because of his opposition to Defense Department policies and to the Test Ban Treaty; Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, who retired in August, 1961, allegedly because of his strong anti-communist views and his opposition to defense policies of building conventional forces at the expense of genuine national defense with superior naval, air, and nuclear power; General Thomas D. White, who retired as Air Force Chief of Staff in July, 1961, allegedly because he was critical of defense policies which would not permit the United States to develop a defense against missiles, or to use her industrial potential to produce the kind of air power and weaponry that would give us unquestioned superiority over the Soviets.

As genuine military men were purged from high place, McNamara and Kennedy moved into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy-making positions, the eggheads—men like Paul F. Nitze, Roswell L. Gilpatric, and Charles J. Hitch of the Council on Foreign Relations; Alain Enthoven and Henry S. Rowen from the Rand Corporation (notorious for its book in 1958 on how American Armed Forces could surrender strategically); and worse-than-eggheads — men like Adam Yarmolinsky.

As General Thomas D. White puts it, the defense policies of the United States are now being formulated by "pipe-smoking, tree-full-of-owls . . . professional . . . intellectuals, . . . overconfident, sometimes arrogant young professors, mathematicians and other theorists."[4]

In May, 1963, after General Curtis LeMay (Air Force Chief of Staff) had testified that he opposed the TFX fighter plane contract award to General Dynamics but was overruled by civilian advisors, Kennedy announced that LeMay would be removed next year. In the summer of 1963, when the Senate was trying to get honest military testimony concerning the test ban treaty, it was obvious that General LeMay had been told how to testify. Senator Goldwater maneuvered General LeMay into admitting that McNamara had never talked to the Joint Chiefs of Staff about the treaty. LeMay conceded that he would be against the treaty if it had not already been negotiated.[5] It is reliably reported that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in secret testimony before a congressional body, opposed the test ban treaty and enumerated its dangers to the United States.[6] In public testimony, the same individuals took a different line.

An influential segment of the public itself is also forced to support key administration policies such as foreign aid, foreign trade, racial integration, and appeasement of communism. This is achieved by economic pressures from the Defense Department (and other big spending agencies): threats to cancel spending and remove installations, or promises of more spending and bigger installations.

In short: forcing military men into controversial politics, through implementation of the Gesell Report (which was written by a group of left-wing racial agitators) is merely the most recent evidence that McNamara and Kennedy are transforming our Armed Forces into a military-political-economic pressure complex whose primary mission is not defense of the nation, but enforcement of the political program of Washington officialdom.

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Born in Missouri, reared in Texas, Dan Smoot went to SMU in Dallas, getting BA and MA degrees in 1938 and 1940. In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a Teaching Fellow in English, doing graduate work for a doctorate in American Civilization.

In 1942, he left Harvard and joined the FBI. As an FBI Agent, he worked for three and a half years on communist investigations in the industrial Midwest; two years as an administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover on FBI headquarters staff in Washington; and almost four years on general FBI cases in various parts of the nation.

In 1951, Smoot resigned from the FBI and helped start Facts Forum. On Facts Forum radio and television programs, Smoot spoke to a national audience, giving *both* sides of controversial issues.

In July, 1955, he resigned and started his present independent publishing and broadcasting business — a free-enterprise operation financed entirely by profits from sales: sales of *The Dan Smoot Report,* a weekly magazine; and sales of a weekly news-analysis broadcast, to business firms, for use on radio and television as an advertising vehicle. The *Report* and the broadcast give only *one* side in presenting documented truth about important issues — the side that uses the American Constitution as a yardstick. The *Report* is available by subscription; and the broadcasts are available for commercial sponsorship, anywhere in the United States.

If you think Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for Americans fighting socialism and communism, you can help immensely — by helping him get more customers for his *Report* and broadcasts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What To Do

(1) Immediately and specifically, the public should urge Congress to enact the Vinson Bill (HR 8460) which would prohibit implementation of the Gesell Report.

(2) For the long run, the people should study the voting records of Representatives and Senators to determine which ones show understanding and respect for the Constitution. All who do not, should be voted out of office. The Constitution places upon Congress the power and responsibility of providing national defense. A congress composed of men with enough brains and integrity to uphold the Constitution, would scrap our present no-win, no-defense policies and initiate a program, infinitely less expensive than the present one, which would defend the United States against foreign enemies.

(3) Most important of all: every one who knows what is happening should make maximum effort to inform others so that there will be enough aroused and informed Americans to compel proper action in Washington.

(4) To the limit of your ability, distribute to others such information as contained in this *Report,* in the *Report* of last week entitled "Reorganizing For Stalemate," and in the *Report* of June 3, 1963, entitled "Planned Dictatorship." We offer these three *Reports* as a set for 50¢.

FOOTNOTES

(1) "Gesell Report," discussion by 30 United States Representatives led by Democrat Representatives L. Mendel Rivers (South Carolina) and Joe D. Waggonner, Jr. (Louisiana); Republican Representatives H. R. Gross (Iowa) and Louis C. Wyman (New Hampshire), including complete text of Gesell Report, *Congressional Record* (daily), August 7, 1963, pp. 13548-99

(2) *Military Cold War Education and Speech Review Policies,* Hearings before the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, 1962, Part IV, pp. 1491-2

(3) Letter from Nathaniel S. Colley to *The Dan Smoot Report,* September 10, 1963

(4) "Strategy and the Defense Intellectuals," by General Thomas D. White, *The Saturday Evening Post,* May 4, 1963, pp. 10, 12

(5) AP dispatch from Washington, *The Dallas Morning News,* August 20, 1963, p. 1

(6) "Washington Whispers," *U.S. News & World Report,* August 26, 1963, p. 28

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Washington officialdom uses your taxes for programs that are creating vast cesspools of waste and corruption — and dragging our Republic into the quicksands of socialism. What can you do about it?

You can help educate and arouse the people who elect men responsible for harmful programs of government. When enough other Americans know and care as you do, political action to restore our Republic will come.

If *The Dan Smoot Report* was instrumental in bringing you to the point of asking what *you* can do about saving the country from mushrooming big government, here is a checklist for you: Have you urged others to subscribe to the *Report?* Have you sent them reprints of a particular issue of the *Report?* Have you shown them a Dan Smoot film? Have you ever suggested a Bound Volume of *The Dan Smoot Report* for use by speakers, debaters, students, writers? Have you read and passed on to others any of the Dan Smoot books — *The Invisible Government, The Hope Of The World, America's Promise?*

Subscription:	6 months	— $ 6.00
	1 year	— $10.00
1962 Bound Volume		— $10.00
The Invisible Government		
Paperback		— $ 3.00
Clothback		— $ 5.00
The Hope Of The World		— $ 2.00
America's Promise		— $ .50
Film Catalogue		— Free
Reprint List		— Free

NAME *(Please Print)*

STREET ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP CODE

(Add 2% Sales Tax in Texas)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED